97-84018-4

Derfel, Robert Jones

An unauthorised programme showing

Manchester

[1890?]

97-84018- 4
MASTER NEGATIVE #

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES
PRESERVATION DIVISION

BIBLIOGRAPHIC MICROFORM TARGET

ORIGINAL MATERIAL AS FILMED - EXISTING BIBLIOGRAPHIC RECORD

308
Z
Box 24
Derfel, R[obert] J[ones]?
An unauthorised programme showing how to abolish poverty... Manchester [1890?]
32 p.

Only Ed.

RESTRICTIONS ON USE: *Reproductions may not be made without permission from Columbia University Libraries.*

TECHNICAL MICROFORM DATA

FILM SIZE: 35 mm REDUCTION RATIO: 10:1 IMAGE PLACEMENT: IA (IIA) IB IIB

DATE FILMED: 2-7-97 INITIALS: MS

TRACKING # : 20420

FILMED BY PRESERVATION RESOURCES, BETHLEHEM, PA.

BIBLIOGRAPHIC IRREGULARITIES

MAIN ENTRY: Derfel, Robert Jones

An unauthorised programme showing how to abolish poverty

Bibliographic Irregularities in the Original Document:

List all volumes and pages affected; include name of institution if filming borrowed text.

_____ Page(s) missing/not available: _____

_____ Volume(s) missing/not available: _____

_____ Illegible and/or damaged page(s): _____

_____ Page(s) or volume(s) misnumbered: _____

_____ Bound out of sequence: _____

X Page(s) or volume(s) filmed from copy borrowed from: Boston Public Library - front and back covers

_____ Other: _____

_____ Inserted material: _____

TRACKING#: MSH20420

FILMED IN WHOLE OR PART FROM A COPY BORROWED FROM:

BOSTON PUBLIC LIBRARY

AN UNAUTHORISED

PROGRAMME,

SHOWING HOW

TO ABOLISH POVERTY,

Without doing an Injustice to anyone, or leaving a feeling of wrong behind.

A COMPLETE REVOLUTION,

Without Bloodshed, Confiscation, or Physical Force.

BY

R. J. DERFEL,
MANCHESTER.

Price Twopence.

R. J. DERFEL, 6, STOVE STREET, MANCHESTER.

TO THE READER.

This pamphlet has been written to show that a change in the basis of society is needed, and that the change can be brought about peaceably, constitutionally, and justly. How far I have succeeded in doing that I must leave the readers to judge, merely saying, that I think I have shown clearly and convincingly that it can be done. The need for such an essay has been felt by many, for all who advocate Socialism are continually challenged to show how it can be done without confiscation. I trust this work will do a little towards making that point clear. If you sympathise with the movement, and approve of this effort to show how to realise it, I would ask you to do what you can to give the Unauthorised Programme as large a circulation as possible. This can be done in many ways :—

After reading it yourself, pass it on to someone else.

Bring it to the notice of your acquaintances.

Get shops to sell it.

If you can afford it, buy some, and leave a copy at the clubs, libraries, societies, &c.

If you cannot afford to give, you can buy some and sell them.

They can be had through the trade or direct from

R. J. DERFEL,

6, Stove Street, Manchester.

AN UNAUTHORISED PROGRAMME,

SHOWING HOW

TO ABOLISH POVERTY,

Without doing an Injustice to anyone, or leaving a feeling of wrong behind. A complete Revolution without bloodshed, confiscation or physical force.

BY R. J. DERFEL, MANCHESTER.

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS.

I offer no apology for writing and publishing an unauthorised programme. Other individuals have done the same thing, and I have the same right, and if you like, the same duty, according to ability and opportunity, as any other individual, and for that matter, as any group of individuals. Duty is co-extensive with ability and opportunity. Whoever sees, or thinks he sees, that the basis of society is rotten, and that the social fabric, in consequence, is in danger, in justice to himself and society, ought to point it out, clearly, promptly, earnestly. If any one sees or thinks he sees a remedy for the poverty and misery seething around him, it is his solemn duty to proclaim it with all the power at his command. If a man saw a railway bridge giving way and did not inform the authorities of it, he would be looked upon as a criminal for his neglect. How much greater is the guilt of the man who sees the danger overhanging society and does not raise an alarm, and who sees a way to avoid the calamity and never reveals it to his fellow man? Whoever sees the danger ought to point it out, and whoever sees a way to avoid it ought to declare it.

That there is a vast amount of poverty, distress, and semi-starvation in our country, everyone who has paid attention to the subject will readily admit. A few facts briefly stated will show that the poverty, degradation, and misery is real and not imaginary.

There is an average of about 3,000,000 of persons in the pauper class. That shows that one out of every eight in the manual labour class is a pauper. In some districts every old labourer is a pauper.

In London one in every five die in the workhouse, hospital, or lunatic asylum. In proportion the state of things is as bad in all other large towns.

Dr. Playfair states that 18 per cent. of the children of the upper class, 36 per cent. of those of the trading class, 55 per cent. of those of the working class, die before they reach five years of age.

8514

INTENTIONAL SECOND EXPOSURE

TO THE READER.

This pamphlet has been written to show that a change in the basis of society is needed, and that the change can be brought about peaceably, constitutionally, and justly. How far I have succeeded in doing that I must leave the readers to judge, merely saying, that I think I have shown clearly and convincingly that it can be done. The need for such an essay has been felt by many, for all who advocate Socialism are continually challenged to show how it can be done without confiscation. I trust this work will do a little towards making that point clear. If you sympathise with the movement, and approve of this effort to show how to realise it, I would ask you to do what you can to give the Unauthorised Programme as large a circulation as possible. This can be done in many ways :—

After reading it yourself, pass it on to someone else.

Bring it to the notice of your acquaintances.

Get shops to sell it.

If you can afford it, buy some, and leave a copy at the clubs, libraries, societies, &c.

If you cannot afford to give, you can buy some and sell them.

They can be had through the trade or direct from

R. J. DERFEL,

6, Stove Street, Manchester.

AN UNAUTHORISED PROGRAMME,

SHOWING HOW

TO ABOLISH POVERTY,

Without doing an Injustice to anyone, or leaving a feeling of wrong behind. A complete Revolution without bloodshed, confiscation or physical force.

BY R. J. DERFEL, MANCHESTER.

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS.

I offer no apology for writing and publishing an unauthorised programme. Other individuals have done the same thing, and I have the same right, and if you like, the same duty, according to ability and opportunity, as any other individual, and for that matter, as any group of individuals. Duty is co-extensive with ability and opportunity. Whoever sees, or thinks he sees, that the basis of society is rotten, and that the social fabric, in consequence, is in danger, in justice to himself and society, ought to point it out, clearly, promptly, earnestly. If any one sees or thinks he sees a remedy for the poverty and misery seething around him, it is his solemn duty to proclaim it with all the power at his command. If a man saw a railway bridge giving way and did not inform the authorities of it, he would be looked upon as a criminal for his neglect. How much greater is the guilt of the man who sees the danger overhanging society and does not raise an alarm, and who sees a way to avoid the calamity and never reveals it to his fellow man? Whoever sees the danger ought to point it out, and whoever sees a way to avoid it ought to declare it.

That there is a vast amount of poverty, distress, and semi-starvation in our country, everyone who has paid attention to the subject will readily admit. A few facts briefly stated will show that the poverty, degradation, and misery is real and not imaginary.

There is an average of about 3,000,000 of persons in the pauper class. That shows that one out of every eight in the manual labour class is a pauper. In some districts every old labourer is a pauper.

In London one in every five die in the workhouse, hospital, or lunatic asylum. In proportion the state of things is as bad in all other large towns.

Dr. Playfair states that 18 per cent. of the children of the upper class, 36 per cent. of those of the trading class, 55 per cent. of those of the working class, die before they reach five years of age.

S514

The average age at death of the upper class is 55 years—amongst the working class of Lambeth it is only 29 years.

Any one wishing for more information on these all-important matters would do well to consult "Facts for Socialists," published by the Fabian Society, London, price one penny.

It will not be unprofitable, perhaps, to give a few testimonies of the present state of society, by men of note and authority who are not Socialists.

"But all agree, and there can be no question whatever, that some remedy must be found, and quickly found, for the misery and wretchedness which press so heavily at this moment on the large majority of the very poor. The ancient workmen's Guilds were destroyed in the last century, and no other organisation took their place. Hence by degrees it has come to pass that working men have been given over, isolated and defenceless, to the callousness of employers and the greed of unrestrained competition The evil has been increased by rapacious usury, which although more than once condemned by the Church, is nevertheless, under a different form, but with the same guilt, still practised by avaricious and grasping men. And to this must be added the custom of working by contract, and the concentration of so many branches of trade in the hands of a few individuals, so that a small number of very rich men have been able to lay upon the masses of the poor a yoke little better than slavery itself."

The Pope's Encyclical.

"To me, at least, it would be enough to condemn modern society as hardly an advance on slavery or serfdom, if the permanent condition of industry were to be that which we behold, that 90 per cent. of the actual producers of wealth have no home that they can call their own beyond the end of the week; have no bit of soil, or so much as a room that belongs to them; have nothing of any kind except as much old furniture as will go in a cart; have the precarious chance of weekly wages which barely suffice to keep them in health; are housed for the most part in places that no man thinks fit for his horse; are separated by so narrow a margin from destitution, that a month of bad trade, sickness or unexpected loss, brings them face to face with hunger and pauperism. . . . *This is the normal state of the average workman in town or country.*" (Mr. Frederic Harrison, p. 429 "Report of Industrial Remuneration Conference," 1886).

"Anyone who is acquainted with the state of the population of all great industrial centres, whether in this or other countries, is aware that amidst a large and increasing body of that population there reigns supreme . . that condition which the French call *la misere*, a word for which I do not think there is any exact English equivalent. It is a condition in which the food, warmth, and clothing which are necessary for the mere maintenance of the functions of the body, in their normal state, cannot be obtained; in which men, women and children are forced to crowd into dens wherein decency is abolished, and the most ordinary conditions of healthful existence are impossible of attainment; in which the pleasures within reach are reduced to brutality and drunkenness; in which the pains accumulate at compound interest in the shape of starvation, disease, stunted development, and moral degradation; in which the prospect of even steady and honest industry is a life of unsuccessful battling with hunger, rounded by a pauper's grave. . . When the organisation of society, instead of mitigating this tendency, tends to continue and intensify it, when a given social order plainly makes for evil and not for good, men naturally enough begin

to think it high time to try a fresh experiment. I take it to be a mere plain truth that throughout industrial Europe there is not a single large manufacturing city which is free from a vast mass of people whose condition is exactly that described, and from a still greater mass, who, living just on the edge of the social swamp, are liable to be precipitated into it."

Professor Huxley, in the "*Nineteenth Century*" for February, 1888.

"The report of the Royal Commission discloses the most appalling state of things—a state of things which is not only a scandal and a disgrace to wealthy England, but which I hold to be a standing danger to our constitutional liberties."—Lord Randolph Churchill in his Walsall Speech.

These declarations could be multiplied again and again were it necessary. And they are the solemn declaration of men who are not Socialists, and on that account are not likely to over colour the picture. In fact, the state of things is so desperate that neither tongue nor pen can ever fully describe its horrors.

Surely, this poverty, degradation and infernal misery ought not to be allowed to continue, if there is a possibility of removing it.

That sufficient wealth can and is being produced in the British Isles to feed all, to clothe all, to educate all, to house all and that well, with plenty to spare, cannot be denied.

Mulhall, in his *Progress of the World*, says, "The world consumes 38,500,000 tons of wheat yearly. At the average English rate of 28 bushels per acre, it would suffice to put Great Britain under wheat to supply all nations. If England were compelled to raise wheat for her own consumption, it would be sufficient to sow an area of five counties the size of Devonshire to supply our needs for the three kingdoms at seven bushels per head."

J. J. Mechi says, "Although the quality of land on my farm is much below the average of the United Kingdom, I produce probably so much more than the usual average yield, that if all our lands were made equally with mine, our population could not consume one half the produce."

Sir Richard Philips says, "The United Kingdom would support 250,000,000 of people on vegetable, or 80,000,000 on flesh and vegetables, without resorting to importation, or to our 30,000,000 acres of waste land.

Allison, in his *Principals of Population*, says, "Great Britain and Ireland are capable of maintaining in ease and affluence 120,000,000 of people."

In spite of these facts we pay more than £120,000,000 a year to other countries for food.

When Ireland had a population of 9,000,000, she exported to England on an average of 20 years, 20,000,000 bushels of wheat per annum. Now with half that population, she has to import 30,000,000 bushels yearly.

An objector might say that the land if got for nothing would not pay at present prices. That may be true if the land is used to produce for sale. But if employed to produce for use it will always pay more than a thousandfold. A bushel or a bushel and a half per acre in seed will, on an average, yield 28 bushels of wheat, which would feed four persons. It is therefore folly to say the land would not pay for cultivation.

Another way to look at the matter. Every worker, it is said, will on an average, produce enough to maintain three persons. The number of workers, plus machinery, in this country must be enormous. Robert Owen, from facts given to the House of Commons Commission, calculated that the workers of this country were equal to more than 200,000,000 of men in the year 1816. The increase since then must be fabulous: and the workers now, I venture to think, must be equal to more than a thousand millions of men—and these to feed some 37,000,000 of people, and a third of these always on the verge of starvation. Clearly, there is a great leak somewhere.

Where the leak is will be seen from the following figures:—

The national income for 1889 was estimated at £1350,000,000, but of this vast sum, rent swallows up £220,000,000—interest, £270,000,000—wages of those who are above the manual labour class, about £360,000,000, leaving only £500,000,000 to be shared by all of the manual labour class. About £850,000,000 is shared by about 10,000,000 of persons, and only about £500,000,000 by the actual workers' class numbering about 27,000,000 of persons. (See Facts for Socialists).

The cause of the poverty is clearly the monopoly of land and capital by the idle wealthy class—in other words, the appropriation of more than half the produce of labour by those who neither toil nor spin. This is the leak. It is as palpable as the sun at noon. It cannot be denied or concealed. And it is useless to try to mystify it, for there is no mystery at all about it.

To cure the evil the cause must be removed—the leak must be stopped. All the agencies at work have failed, and must fail because they leave the cause of the mischief untouched. They pump a little water out of the ship merely to make room for more. All the labour is in vain, and the energy and time are wasted in a fruitless endeavour. As long as land and capital remain private property—and as long as individuals are allowed to compete unrestricted, and appropriate to themselves the produce of other men's labour, poverty will exist in spite of every means used to try to abolish it.

As a means of abolishing poverty trade unions are a failure. Co-operation for profit to pay dividend is also a failure. The least reflection will make it clear that it is so. The profit to pay dividend must

come from somewhere—from themselves or somebody else. If it comes from themselves, it is only a kind of saving—taking their own money from one pocket of their own to put it in another of their own. If the profit comes from outsiders, the amount of profit to the co-operators will be exactly the amount of loss to the outsiders. In money matters there is no way to make a profit to one except from the loss of another. A co-operation of all would be Socialism—a co-operation of some to make profit to pay dividend, requires outsiders to suffer loss to make up the profit.

Profit Sharing,

in the same way, even were it universal, would leave the bulk of poverty untouched. Profit would have to be made before it could be shared—and profit could not be made without outsiders to provide it, without receiving anything for it, which to them would be a loss. Even were workers made owners of the concerns where they labour, it would merely increase the number of masters, without conferring any benefit on the masses outside. Collective ownership, say of a colliery, by all the colliers working there, would make a corporate owner with less concern for others than one or more individuals have.

Under a competitive and an individualistic system of society,

Every palliative is an aggravative

at the same time. An advantage is a disadvantage, a success is an unsuccess, profit is loss, a victory is a defeat, for is against, prosperity is a disaster. Getting on is getting someone off to stand on his neck to rise. The great success of a late millionaire bookseller, was made by crushing thousands of small booksellers and stationers out of existence. Buying a horse worth £30 for £20 is a bargain of £10 to the buyer, but a loss of £10 to the seller. Co-operation for profit to shareholders is a co-operation to inflict a loss on outsiders. When members of corporations advance the wages of their already too highly paid servants, they reduce the wages of the ratepayers, who are made to pay the higher wages. When a trade union strike for higher wages to themselves, they strike to reduce the wages of all others. The higher wages paid to colliers, will increase the price of coal, and their own fellow workers will have to bear the loss. The increase of inspectors is bound to increase the rate, and ratepayers are bound to suffer, and in the long run the workers themselves will have to suffer the loss *Socialists who cry for an increase of officials make a wreck of their Socialism.* Nothing more absurd can be imagined than to hear men who profess to be socialists clamouring for increasing non-producers. They rail against

landlords and capitalists because they are drones, and at the same time urge on the government to increase officials, who will be more unbearable than landlords and capitalists, and more difficult to get rid of. The number of officious government servants was one of the great causes of the French Revolution. Do working men really want more inspectors, or is it a cry of the leaders in hope that some of the snug offices will fall to them? We hear men declare that the workers produce all the wealth; if that be true, and it is easy to prove that it is true, then as a matter of course, they keep all the drones in existence, official as well as non-official. The more drones the workers have to keep, and the more they have to work, and the less they will get for working. Clamouring for more inspectors is nothing in reality but clamouring for more masters, more drones to feed, more burdens to carry, more taxes to pay, more work, less leisure, and less pay. Every working man and woman ought to be inspectors themselves. If the cry goes on for more inspectors to see that things are done right, they will soon want inspectors to see that every worker washes his face. Were every worker what they ought to be in their own personal habits, there would not be near the cause of complaint that there is. There is nothing an inspector can do which the workers themselves could not do themselves better and quicker. There are thousands of evils being suffered that no inspector may see, that would be speedily swept away were the workers taught, individually and collectively, to be inspectors for themselves.

Thrift, Temperance, Clubs, Insurance,

and the like, however good in themselves, and beneficial in individual cases, are all bound to be failures to the masses, as long as competition and individualism are allowed to remain, and private property in land and capital is tolerated. To the swift and the strong, to all or most of those who have exceptional abilities and advantages, to the cruel and the unscrupulous, to the lions and tigers of humanity, the present system may be tolerable on the whole; but to the mass of the people it means perpetual misery. In a fight the lamb has no chance against the lion, nor the slow and weak against the swift and strong. The poor are handicapped from their birth, and their only hope of salvation is in a brotherhood of all men, a co-operation of all in organised labour, and a community of interest for all in the result.

Shortening the hours of labour

will be only a temporary benefit whilst individualism and competition remain. Eight hours a day is long enough to work. Under Socialism it would suffice to work very few hours per day on an average, to produce more than enough to satisfy all wants. But it is doubtful what good an eight hours day will do under existing conditions. Some of those firms who have adopted the eight hours assert that they get as much work done in the eight hours as they got before in nine or ten. If that proves true all round, shortening the hours will not absorb the unemployed. Further, unless it is made a punishable offence for any man to work more than eight hours in one day, is it not possible, and even probable, that many men will work a day and a half or even two days in one? Or, if they cannot work more than a day in a day, is it not possible that amongst the industrious workers some new means of turning the increased leisure into money will spring up? If women had a say in the matter, I fear many of them would declare that the men have too much leisure already, and that if they have more they will spend all they earn in the public-house, and leave their wives and children to starve. Another consideration would be,—can the hours be shortened without reducing wages, or what amounts to the same thing, advancing the price of commodities? If the condition of workers generally is made worse by reducing the hours, is it not likely that the majority of adult workers will go against the eight hours day? The idea amongst many advocates of the eight hours day is, that the admitted extra cost can be extracted from the pockets of employers, landlords and capitalists, but in this I fear they are mistaken. The cost of shortening the hours of work must ultimately come mainly from the workers themselves. If government increase the number of its servants, taxes will have to be increased to pay the increased cost, and taxes are paid by the people, and all come from the labour of the workers. Besides, it is almost certain that if hours of labour are shortened, means will be found to turn out as much work, or more, in the same time, and the benefit of the shorter hours would be lost, and things would be practically as bad as ever. The fact is, no real and permanent improvement can be brought about without changing the basis of society. As long as private property in land and capital remain, the poor and unemployed will be always with us. And until we establish, or at all events, begin to establish a new system of society, whereby the living of the people will not depend on foreign trade, we cannot, without committing suicide, ignore the competition of rival countries. To insist on hours and wages in this country that would make it impossible for us to compete successfully with other nations would be simply and literally to

Kill the goose that lays the golden eggs.

It is easy enough to deride the idea, but it would be impossible to avoid a wide-spread distress amongst the workers, were it to take

place. Until we get the land back and the people back on the land, we ought to be careful not to do anything that will endanger the prosperity of the people.

Present institutions must be destroyed by new ones.

However bad the slums may be it would be stupid folly to destroy them till you have new and better houses in their place. The only way to destroy the slums is to abolish poverty, and change the character of slum dwellers. Remove those who live in the slums to the best possible houses, and they would turn them into new slums. They live in the slums because they are poor, and the only way to improve them is to lift them up from poverty. The rags many of the poor have to wear are bad enough, as every one knows; still it would be worse than folly to destroy them till better clothing is got in their place. Instead of wasting time, energy, and money on palliatives, which under existing conditions will be palliatives to some only, whilst they are bound to be aggravatives to others,—all reformers, and especially all socialists, ought to unite their efforts to establish the new society side by side with present institutions, so that the superiority of the new may show the inferiority of the old, and that will be the best and quickest way to get rid of it. Bronze tools superseded the stone ones. Iron took the place of bronze. Mud cabins superseded the natural caves. Stone houses destroyed the mud cabins. Tallow candles did away with the rushlights. Gas has partially superseded the candle. And now the electric light threatens the gas. The new society must be established in the same way—by its evident superiority over the old. I can see no way to replace individualism and competition, except by showing in actual everyday life, the great superiority of organised co operation in labour for the common good, and a community of interest in the results.

Minimum Wages

is another will-o'-the-wisp that many exhaust their strength in running after, as if it were an object in itself. The fact is, wages cannot be made a fixture. What is the use of fixing a high rate of wages if prices go up accordingly? It matters nothing if wages be only a penny a day, if the penny will buy all that we want to keep us in comfort. Food, clothing and shelter is what we want, and wages are only a means to get them. Fair wage is the best wage a man can get and an employer can pay. A wage an employer cannot pay without becoming a bankrupt, is certainly not fair to the employer, nor beneficial to the worker, for it will lose him his employ-

ment. They call a trade union firm a fair house, implying that a non-union firm is an unfair house. Nothing can be further from the truth. A firm may be a trade union firm and be the worst possible employers, and a firm may be a non-union firm and be the best of masters, as many workers know from experience. Under present conditions I know of no standard of value, except supply and demand. In certain cases no doubt, an artificial value may be attached to certain things, such as the services of judges and ministers, but obviously this could not be done all round. The wildest trade unionist would not dream that it is possible to pay the salary of a judge to every worker in Britain. But my point is, that the establishment of a minimum wage, say of sixpence an hour, would not mend matters under existing conditions. The probability is, that under a system of minimum wage, the number of unemployed and partially employed would be far greater than at present. Besides, a minimum wage, like minimum prices, has always a tendency to be the maximum. But suppose that a minimum wage and an eight hours day were fixed—suppose that none were allowed to work except in inspected factories, would that find work for the unemployed? Would it find customers for our productions? Would it secure profitable prices for our merchants? Would it keep prices down so that a shilling would always go as far as it does now? Would it prevent depression of trade and commercial crisis? The least reflection, I think, will compel an emphatic *no* to all these questions and many others that might be asked. Therefore the value of them even as palliatives is very uncertain, and the time and energy devoted to obtain them would be better employed to convert the people to the great doctrine of brotherhood which we call Socialism.

Even supposing, for the sake of argument, that existing agencies were moderately successful in the objects they have in view, everyone must know that there is a vast amount of anxiety and worry and labour connected with them, and it is all a non-productive labour. All the staff of trade unions, clubs, insurances, building societies and the like, have to be fed, clothed, and housed by those who work. But under Socialism none of these would be required; trade unions, insurances, sick and burial clubs, and all such societies and agencies would cease to be, and all who perform the useless unproductive toil connected with them would be free to do their share of some useful service for the common good.

In a socialist society, all healthy and able would be required to do

some useful service for the common good.

There will be no room for drones. The vast army who are engaged in the useless toil of ministering to the vanities of the idle rich in one

way or another, will be released, and they will contribute their share to the wealth of the community. When all are engaged in producing real wealth, it is clear that the wealth will be so abundant, that the leisure of the people will be great compared with that enjoyed by the masses at the present time. As the means of living will be equally abundant for all, there will be no need for children to begin to work in childhood. The time and means of education enjoyed now by the children of the wealthy will then be enjoyed by the children of all. Every child in the land can have the best education possessed by the country, that is, an university training for all capable of receiving it. The education can then be given under more pleasant conditions, both for teacher and scholars. The anxiety and worry pressing heavily on teachers now will disappear. Fear of ill health, or old age, without any provision against want, will oppress them no more. And there will be no need for the hurry and high pressure practised now in connection with the children of the masses.

Much if not most of the misery of the world, under present conditions, is caused by the

uncertainty of our means of livelihood,

and fear and anxiety about the future. Even the rich are not free from it. Banks fail. Merchants become bankrupts. Directors become thieves. Wealthy people are reduced to poverty every day. Comparatively only a few can be said to be above the fear of poverty. The great middle class, composed in a great measure of the trading community, are bound to be haunted continually by fear and anxiety, owing to the extreme uncertainty of their means of subsistence. But the greatest victims of all to the fears and anxiety owing to the uncertainty of health and employment, are the workers. In their case, the failure of health or employment bring with them immediate suffering, for the wages of most of them are too small to enable them to make provision for a rainy day. But under Socialism, all the anxiety, worry, uncertainty and fear of poverty, would be done away with. If sickness comes there will be the best medical attendance, best nursing and nourishment without loss of wages, and without thought of tax and rent collectors or doctors' bills. If death comes, there will be no undertaker to devour the substance of widows and orphans. There will be no breaking up of homes and sending mothers out to char, and children to the workhouse because their father died. With co-operation in labour and a community of interest in the results, there will be abundance of everything required by all, and a security for all in their enjoyment.

That a society established on the

Principles of Socialism

would be superior to the present competitive and individualistic system, would be readily admitted by most thoughtful men. If all were well fed, well housed, well educated, well conducted, with plenty of leisure for enjoyment, surely life in their midst would be more pleasant and safer, than amongst crowds of ill fed, ill clad, ill educated, ill housed, who are in consequence a source of danger to the health and morality of the public. It is useless to say that human nature bars the way—improved surroundings will improve the race. The incentives to efforts at excellence in such a state will certainly be as numerous and as strong as they are at present, and will consist mainly in the love of greatness and the affection and admiration of their fellows. Some trouble themselves greatly as to what would become of men of exceptional ability in such a society. But there is no need to trouble about that. In any society that can be established, there will be a top, a middle, and a bottom. But the top need not be so high that it cannot be approached, nor the bottom so low that no one would willingly enter it. As a rule—there is no rule without exceptions—the class at the bottom now, and at the top now, will be top and bottom in the new society. In the society that is to be, leaders will be wanted,—captains of industries, architects, designers, teachers, professors, doctors and many others will be needed then as now. The number of able men, in all probability, will be greater then than now, and there will be no need then to confine any one to one thing through life. The lawyers, judges, bankers, accountants, agents, landlords, capitalists, money lenders, and all the useless toilers in the present society, will disappear as a class. But the men, often extremely clever, will find more useful employment in other directions. And those who are so anxious about a possible future Shakespeare, may take it for granted that an improved society will be not only as favourable, but more favourable to the production of great minds.

But how is the great change to be brought about? I only know of two ways:—revolution and evolution.

Revolution

is a social explosion, a political earthquake, a revolt against injustice, an uprising to secure better conditions of life. There are abundance of causes to justify the greatest revolution possible. The selfishness, haughtiness, and cruel indifference of the wealthy towards the sufferings of the poor, deserve destruction at a blow, were it possible. It is sorrowful to think that untold millions of men must suffer for ages

whilst evolution is slowly working out their emancipation. Could the people end their miseries by a single revolution,—greater than the French Revolution, it would be their duty to rise, and no one could justly blame them for it. Successful rebels are the heroes of the world, but unsuccessful heroes are its great criminals. But the chances against any revolution succeeding are enormous, and it would be a criminal madness to attempt it. Therefore the only method left is

Evolution.

Evolution works slowly but surely. It is a growth. It brings about greater changes than any revolution, however successful, could accomplish. No change can succeed till the people themselves are changed. Socialism will only work successfully amongst Socialists. Were an Act of Parliament passed, embodying the principles of Socialism, it would be a dead letter, because the great majority of the people are not Socialists. Evolution will change the conditions of life by changing the people. The changing of the people must come first, and it must come by education. Society will not be changed by a miracle nor by magic. Evolution works through men as well as through nature. In social matters, men are the chief means, nature assisting their efforts.

To convert the world to Socialism, Socialists must be the instruments.

The whole world must be converted, and who but Socialists can or will do it. It is therefore of the utmost importance that Socialists should adopt the right method, and cultivate a right spirit. Socialism is a community of interest, a brotherhood of all men. Anything that tends to perpetuate classes, is neither of the nature or spirit of Socialism. Socialism is a thing of the future, and the shape it will take will depend on the united wisdom of the people through their representatives, when the question becomes practicable. But the future depends in a great measure on the present. As the twig is bent, the tree will grow. If the Socialist movement is moulded in a cramped, narrow, bitter and hateful mould, it will be difficult, if not impossible to get it out of it in the future. I fear an enemy has got hold of some Socialists, or who call themselves Socialists, for they seem to me to advocate the cause in such a way as to make its success nigh impossible. If I had their ears, I would say to them that they know not of what spirit they are. "They that take the sword shall perish by the sword." Tigerism will fill the world with tigers,—but not with men and angels. Hatred will provoke hatred. To treat men as enemies, because they cannot see eye to eye with

us is a sure means, in many cases, to turn unconverted neutrals into active opponents. An *Ishmael*, whose hand is against everybody, may flatter himself that he is independent, but he is not, and you can take it for granted that everybody will be against him, and will crush him. A policy of bluster and abuse will never succeed. It would be a pity if it did. A runaway railway engine will never make a railway line, though it may destroy one. A horse has so little brain that it would not turn aside to pass a child on its road, and will go on blindly to its own destruction. A horsey policy will never do in the advocacy of Socialism. I dwell on this point because I am painfully convinced that an unreasoning, bitter, hateful, and cantankerous advocacy of Socialism, does the movement an untold amount of harm. The mission of Socialism must be

A mission of reason.

Brain must be the controlling power in the work. The triumphs of intelligence are incomparably greater than the triumphs of anything else. The intelligence that has covered the world with railways and telegraphs—the sea, with ships and steamers,—and town and country with palatial structures, is more than equal to the task of bringing about a new state of society, where poverty will cease to be. Show that the present institutions are unjust and injurious to the many, and good people will turn against them. Show that Socialism is just, reasonable, beneficial and practicable, and the good will accept it. People cling to errors because they think they are truths, and they reject truths because they think they are errors. Therefore our mission must be to expose the errors and explain the truths till the errors are abandoned, and the truths are accepted. Show the principle of the multiplication table to any intelligent man, and he could not reject it if he tried, in fact, he could never try to reject it. Demonstrate that the earth is a globe, and the old notion of a plane disappears from the mind of everyone capable of understanding. In the same way individualism and competition must be driven from the world by showing the superiority of co-operation and community of interest. Our weapons must be the pen and the tongue, which are far mightier than the sword.

The mission of Socialism must be for all.

It must appeal to every class. If there is to be a party at all, it should be a party of man, irrespective of class or distinction,—and it should be called the Socialist party. Why should any who profess to be Socialists, call themselves by any other name? If labourism means the same thing as Socialism, why change the name? If it means something different or something less than Socialism, it is

unsocialistic to establish it. Trade unionism, co-operation for profit, profit sharing, and the like, are no more Socialism than landlordism or capitalism are Socialism, and it would be as consistent for Socialists to labour to extend them, as it is to try and multiply trade unionists and profit co-operators. The efforts of all socialists should be directed to make Socialists, and to establish socialistic institutions. Socialism means the brotherhood of all men—yet some who profess to be socialists, adopt rules which are bound to exclude the great majority of the people from their party. Socialism teaches the interdependence of all—yet some socialists take to themselves the name *Independent*. Whatever it may mean, it is an unsocialistic term to apply to Socialists. As a matter of mere policy, to say nothing of principle, it is a great mistake to narrow the socialistic movement to the confines of the workers, or to conduct the propaganda in such a way as to make it impossible for any from the middle and upper classes to join it. Great praise is due to the workers who have gone to the lanes and highways and the street corners to proclaim the gospel of Socialism. But it must never be forgotten that the movement owes more to members of the middle and upper classes, though few in number, than to all the workers put together. The slaves did not emancipate themselves—and the wage slaves of the world, if ever they are to be free, must receive powerful help from the middle and upper classes. Therefore socialists ought to conduct their propaganda in such a way, as to make it possible for men from the upper classes to work in the same society and on the same platform with the sons of toil.

The mission of Socialism must aim at the complete emancipation of all classes.

All who have had any experience in advocating Socialism amongst the workers will admit the difficulty of getting them to comprehend and accept its doctrines. As a rule, it is easier to make converts amongst students, teachers, professors, and members of the middle and upper classes, than amongst the aristocrats of labour. The workers are in bondage mentally as well as socially, and they must be emancipated before any progress can be made. The middle and upper classes are in bondage, mentally and socially, as well as the worker. Their education and surroundings have made them what they are. They are slaves of circumstances quite as truly as the workers are. To blame them for being what they are, is as unreasonable as it would be to blame the labouring class for being workers. Many of the middle class, especially the trading portion of it, are greater slaves, and are more to be pitied, than the workers themselves. Many an employer works night and day in continual anxiety and

worry to find work and wages for those he employs, an anxiety of which the workers know nothing. Many speak and write as if all employers were swimming in success, whereas only few are successful, and the many are struggling all along, and finally lost in the bankruptcy court. Advocates of Socialism often seem to imply that the upper classes are entirely to blame for all the wrongs of the workers, but the implication is not true. Society as a whole is responsible, and the workers are as guilty as any other class, for being the most numerous, if they exercised their votes as they should do, they would return a sufficient number of men to Parliament to speedily alter the state of things. But it must be the work of all classes, and all require emancipation before the change becomes possible.

The mission of Socialism must be one of love and peace, and not of war and hatred.

Socialism is a religion of love and peace and goodwill amongst men. Love thy neighbour as thyself is the motto of all true Socialists. All men are brethren, therefore there ought to be equality, liberty, and fraternity amongst them. If so, it is surely unsocialistic to treat our brethren, though erring, as enemies. It is with sorrow I witness that some powerful and deservedly popular leaders teach their followers to treat all who cannot see eye to eye with them on social matters, as enemies. Supposing they were foes, as a matter of mere policy, at all events until Socialists are strong enough to conquer them, it is a criminal blunder to attempt to convert them by hurling defiance and war in their faces. We want to convert all to our views, but if we go forth with daggers in our hands, dynamite in our pockets, and murder in our hearts, we are not likely to convert anybody worth converting. The spirit breathed in the words, "love thy enemies; do good to them that hate thee;" "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do," would do more to convert the world, than all the force and hatred men are capable of. But it is not true that the upper classes as a class, or that both or either of the political parties as a party are enemies to the workers. Only those are enemies who are wilfully opposed to the interest of the workers. Selfish and indifferent no doubt they are, but wilful and malicious opponents in any class are not numerous. Neither is it true that non-union masters as a class are

Unfair Employers.

The public are often lectured for giving their work to unfair houses, meaning non-union houses. Societies have been known to refuse grants of literature for distribution, because they were printed in non-society houses. Socialist printers are boycotted because they are not

trade unionists. Socialists have taken their work from non unionist brother Socialists, and given it to anti-socialist firms. Conduct like this may be consistent in a trade unionist, but it is very inconsistent in Socialists. What are called fair houses are often very unfair, and non-union houses as a class will bear a favourable comparison with the best in the land. It is equally impolitic on the part of Socialists to abuse and vilify workers because they are not

Trade Unionists.

According to R. Giffen, before the Labour Commission, the number of trade unionists was in round numbers 871000, out of a total of over 10,000,000 adult workers. Yet this small minority speak and write as if all the universe belonged to them. They seem to think that all the work there is to be had is their private property, for they call all non-union workers, who are at least nine to one of the total number, rats, blacklegs, knobsticks, and so forth, because they dare to work against the orders of the unionists. Workers have a right to combine and to demand the highest wages that can be got, but they have no right to compel others to sacrifice themselves for their benefit, and they have no right to claim any labour in the market as their private property. Non-unionists have as much right to a share of the work of the world as the unionists have, and it would be quite as justifiable for them to call the unionists names, as it is for trade unionists to apply such names to free labourers. If trade unionists had reason and justice on their side, they would need nothing but arguments. Calling names indicates a bad case on either side. In a mere trade unionist it cannot be defended or excused. But for Socialists to call the great majority of their brethren all the bad names the language contains is not only unsocialistic, it is a blunder and almost a crime against Socialism. Truth does not require such means to propagate it or defend it. If you want to teach the multiplication table, you do not go about it fiercely and furiously, as if you were going to tear your pupil to pieces. Socialism should be taught warmly if you like, and earnestly, but above all, as deliberately and clearly as a teacher propounding a problem in Euclid No work can ever be done well in a passion. War will never reconstruct society. Your fields will never be ploughed by fighting. You say the slums must be destroyed—true; but the best way to destroy them is to build something better in their place first. The ragged clothing of the poor is better than no clothing, till you get better clothing ready.

The mission of Socialism must be one of patience and hope.

The need for patience is self-evident to every reflective mind.

Human nature is very conservative. Customs and habits are persistent and difficult to change. Workmen when in work and moderately well paid are as apathetic and indifferent to the welfare of the poor as the landlords and capitalists are. The number of people who are satisfied with our present system is great. Millions on millions, as owners or receivers of profit, rent, interest, or as participators in some gain or privilege, are benefitted by the system, and their influence on others connected with or dependent upon them is great. The intellects of many are warped by their education and surroundings, so that they are unable to see the injustice of our present system. Owing to education and other influences there are a vast number of the workers themselves ever ready to defend the supposed rights and privileges of the wealthy. The churches, with scarcely an exception, are on the side of private property and privileges. Government and law, supported by all their servants, from the bum to the judge, and defended by the police, the army and navy, are under the control and at the command of the upper classes. They have a monopoly of the education, leisure, opportunities and wealth of the country; and wealth and influence and power enable them to buy any number they require of the sons of toil, to fight their battles and slaughter their foes. Clearly there is need for patience. The work is great, and it will take a long time to do it even partially. Evolution works slowly, and takes a long time to bring about great changes. It is a consciousness of this that drives many good souls to brood over a revolution, that would accomplish in a short period what would take ages to bring about by evolution. Many who have no faith in revolutions almost despair at the vastness of the work, and the difficulties in the way of its accomplishment. Yet we must have hope, and we have solid ground to base our hope upon. There is a widely-spread feeling of unrest and dissatisfaction with things as they are. The masses are awaking and resolving that the conditions of their lives must be altered; and the spread of education and increase of intelligence will quicken and intensify the movement. Amongst all classes there is a general agreement that things are wrong, and that a remedy must be found. A great and an increasing number of the leading minds of the age, have accepted Socialism as the only effectual remedy for our social evils. There is now a clear conception of the evil and the cure. Socialism is in the air, and the trend of all legislation is in the direction of Socialism. Ideas and facts by means of the press and the quickened international communications, ripen public opinion with greater speed now than ever before. We have therefore reasons for hoping and trusting that great changes can be brought about in much less time in the future than in the past. And the agencies to bring the changes about are numerous and increasing.

All great changes are made up of thousands of small changes. It will be the same with the coming social revolution. Things that appear small in themselves, become great in the aggregate. There are many societies established with the express purpose of spreading the doctrines of Socialism. The Social Democratic Federation and Fabian Society have branches in nearly all populous centres, besides active members all over the country. There are also the Socialist League and the Anarchists. The last, though individualists as to government, advocate the holding of land and capital as common property. The Independent Labour Party have also a socialistic programme. There are also the Christian Socialists, Labour Church, New Fellowship, various brotherhoods, Home Colonization Society, and others whose members are all Socialists. In addition, there are thousands who are not connected with any particular society, but who are Socialists, and many of them by means of the press, pamphlets, books, sermons, discussions and orations, do all they can to spread the light of the new gospel broadcast over the land. The Land Nationalization Society, and the Land Restoration League, work in the direction of Socialism as far as the land is concerned, and many land nationalizers are in favour of nationalizing capital as well. And the Socialistic movement is not confined to our country. In America, France, Germany, and all civilized countries, the movement has taken root, and in some of them it has gained success far greater than in the British Islands. Surely there is no cause for despondency. So much sowing of good seed in good soil will produce an abundant harvest in due season. The goodness of the cause, the truth of the doctrine, the justice of its demands, and the fruitful benefits of its application are all sufficient of themselves to keep our hope and faith in the ultimate triumph of Socialism alive and active. What is wanted now is a

Visible Beginning,

something tangible that an ordinary poor man may hope to realise and enjoy during his own lifetime. Benefits and conditions of life worked out by the slow process of evolution in hundreds of years to come, may influence the minds of poets, philosophers, and the higher intelligencies, but they are too remote to influence ordinary working men. They must have something they can see and understand, something that will make it easier for them to live happy, and will give them more security against extreme poverty than they possess at the present time. How to do this I will endeavour to show in the programme.

But before I proceed to the programme I wish to call attention to one thing—Would it not be possible to persuade many who are in

comfortable situations themselves, not to enter into business, singly or collectively, so that others without any means of livelihood may have a chance to live? Why should civil servants, who work short hours and are well paid, and whose salaries come from the pockets of the ratepayers, singly and collectively enter into business, and thereby prevent others from getting a living by such businesses? Why should not clergymen be satisfied with their substantial and secure livings, without embarking in trade, in competition with persons who have nothing else to live by? Why should schoolmasters who have a living profession, form scholastic companies to prevent others as far as they can from getting a living as school stationers and booksellers? Why should ministers who are maintained by the subscriptions of the people, compete with some of them in trade, and make it impossible for them to get a living? The competition of such people is unfair from the beginning. The mere trader has to make his livelihood by trade, whilst his professional competitors have a livelihood secured independent of trade. So to speak, the mere trader has to carry his competitor on his back, and compete with him at the same time. Is it any wonder that crowds of small shopkeepers are crushed to the wall every year? They swell the number of the unemployed. Thousands of families are reduced to beggary. The victims crowd the workhouses. And many lose their health by worry and anxiety, and die, whilst others end their existence to escape from their troubles. Civil servants, schoolmasters, clergymen, ministers, and others who have a secured livelihood, are largely responsible for the ruin of these people. They may, and possibly are unconscious of the ruin they bring about—nevertheless, they are guilty of their social murder. Is it not time to raise a cry against the cruel selfishness that makes so many who are in comfortable circumstances themselves, either singly or collectively, enter into trade and make it impossible for others to get a living by those trades? The Prophet of old thundered forth in the following memorable words:—"Woe unto them that join house to house, that lay field to field, till there be no place, that they may be placed alone in the midst of the earth." What took place in the days of Isaiah, is now under our very eyes taking place in Britain, and with the same disastrous results. Had Isaiah been living in these days, he would have said:—"Woe to them that join house to house, that lay field to field, that form syndicates, trusts, scholastic companies, household stores and the like, that add business to business and shop to shop, till there be no place for men to make a living, and they become exiled wretches in their own country." Is it too much to hint that ministers of all churches, and teachers and leaders of the people, should show some regard for others, and allow others to have a chance at least of making a living as well as them-

selves? More is expected from them than from others—they, above all, ought to be the salt of the earth. "Salt is good: but if the salt have lost his savour, wherewith shall it be seasoned? It is neither fit for the land nor yet for the dunghill; but men cast it out. He that hath ears to hear, let him hear."

Things are getting worse instead of better. Monopolists in these days are not satisfied with joining house to house, and laying shop to shop and business to business—they join town to town, and country to country in their eager desire to grab all to themselves, and crush all opposition and every competitor if they could. Publicans and shopkeepers are rapidly becoming mere caretakers, liable to be discharged at any moment. If all were compelled to choose their calling, and to be satisfied with one, tens of thousands would be able to live, who are now swelling the number of the unemployed. It would be nothing but simple justice to compel every one to be satisfied with one craft, one shop, one profession, one calling, because the joining together of many by one man, or by a company of men, is a fruitful cause of poverty and misery in the land. But as this cannot be done now, we must try and find some other means to produce the same effect.

"Live and let live," is a sound maxim. Leaders and teachers ought to teach it and practise it as well. But that is the last thing they think of doing. The motto of all seems to be—live and get rich, and let all others starve. Self and number one is the gospel practised by nearly all. John Ruskin has written, truly I fear:—"England has become a nation of thieves. Everybody is trying to rob everybody else, and that not bravely and strongly, but in the cowardly and loathsome way of lying trade." He might with equal truth have said that we are also a nation of hypocrites. We profess to be a nation of Christians. We pretend to teach our duty to love our neighbour as ourselves, and to do to others as we would others should do to us. But it is all lip worship. We neither believe it nor try to practise it. Our golden rule is the exact reverse of that taught by Jesus. Love thyself and rob thy neighbour: and do to others what you would not like others to do to you, is the rule believed in and practised by all or nearly all in these days of competition, and every one for himself. Adam Smith said:—"It is impossible for one to become exceedingly rich, without making many others correspondingly poor." And that is what all are trying to do, utterly regardless of the ruin it brings on the nation. But the time is coming, and that rapidly, when a millionaire will be looked upon as one who has made thousands of poor in order to make himself rich.

PROGRAMME.

To lift up the masses we want, in the first place,

A Fulcrum and Lever.

What will it be? How can we get it? We want it soon and certain. Is there anything that can be got? Whatever it is, it must be compulsory. Anything optional is bound to be a failure. I am tempted to think sometimes, that the privileged classes grant permisssive measures so easily, because they know they will be failures. Voluntaryism has been tried long, and has signally failed in all things essential to universal well-being. It has been tried in many things and has not succeeded thoroughly in anything. Voluntaryism is one with individualism, and only succeeds with the few. Our rulers have always, and still do, make the fullest use of force and compulsion in their own interest, and that is why the few are so privileged and wealthy and the many so poor and miserable. As long as silly Esaus are allowed to sell themselves and their birthright for a bowl of soup, there will always be Jacobs ready to buy them. Society in its own interest must stop the selling and the buying by force. The man who sells his birthright, as well as the man who buys it, must be treated as offenders against society. Is there anything that can be enforced by compulsion, that will begin at once to improve the condition of all the workers and all the struggling traders. There is one thing, and that one thing is,

A free inalienable home for all the people.

Of all oppressions there is none so glaringly unjust and so fruitful of ruin and misery as house rent. House rent often amounts to more than a fourth of a man's earnings. In the case of struggling shopkeepers, the rent more than anything else is the chief cause of their failure. After paying rent for forty years, and paying the value of the house or shop thrice over, not a brick of it belongs to the tenant. A home in the true sense of the word, only a few comparatively possess. The great mass of the people are mere lodgers and tenants at will, liable to be ordered out or evicted when the so-called landlord wills. The consequence is that the workers and traders are totally dependent on others. How often have workers been evicted from houses belonging to their employers, and how often have they been compelled to yield owing to the same reason. If shopkeepers owned their shops they could manage to live, but the excessive rent they have to pay drives them into the bankruptcy court and ruin. If

the workers had a free home from which they could not be evicted, they would be far more independent and more able to resist oppression and demand just reward for their labour. Why should not governments take in hand to provide free inalienable homes for all the people? What are governments good for if not to see that all the people are well fed, well clothed, and well housed? If governments allow the people to be robbed and starved in the midst of plenty, the country would be better off without government than with it. It is said that the home of the Briton is his castle, but it is not for the great majority, and never will be till all who desire it have a free inalienable home, and the law which allows the breaking up of home by eviction is abolished for ever, as it ought to be. But how can the workers and others become the owners of their houses? Thus:—A law must be passed to compel all who have houses and other buildings to let, to sell them, to be paid for in weekly, monthly, or quarterly instalments, spread over a number of years, according to amount and circumstances. To carry out the act, a court would have to be established, which would cheaply fix the value of the houses, the mode and time of payment, and other matters in the interest of buyers and sellers. To make the act a success, compulsion would have to be applied, to make the owner sell and the tenant to buy. There would be no confiscation, for the owner would get his own back, and in the course of about a dozen years, an incalculable benefit would be conferred upon the country at large. The possibility and simplicity of this plan is such that no serious opposition could be raised against it, and even should the possessing class refuse to move in the matter, the workers could be induced to declare a universal strike against rent, which would speedily bring the landlords to their senses, and no sensible man would blame the workers for striking under such circumstances. Even in a socialistic state, I maintain, it would be necessary for the protection of the individual, to have free inalienable homes, for all know that companies, corporations, directorates and governments can be more cruel to the individual than the most heartless individual landlord.

The next thing to do is to establish

Home Colonies on Crown Land.

Crown land is national land. There is no landlord to demand exorbitant price for any portion of it. No law would be required to enable the government to turn crown land to national use. The pressing want of the day is to find the means of livelihood to the unemployed. This could be done by inviting suitable persons to found village colonies on crown lands in convenient localities all over the

country. To make these successful, it would be necessary to select men who have been employed on the land, and understand how to cultivate it. To send men on the land who know nothing about it, would be to send them to certain failure. The suitable men must be from the unemployed, if amongst them, or taken from warehouse, factory, foundry, or shop. The one thing indispensable must be fitness for the work. Everyone taken from other employment will make room for the out-of-work, and gradually the unemployed would disappear. The greatest difficulty would be the finding of food, clothing, and shelter for the first twelve months to a sufficient number, to tell visibly on the unemployed. But the difficulty can easily be overcome by a great and wealthy country. The land could be given rent free for a few years until the produce of the land would be sufficient to enable the settlers to pay rent, which should be low enough not to be oppressive. By selecting variety enough of callings to make the settlement self-contained, the colonists could build their own houses, make their own furniture, clothing, shoes, &c. The first twelve months would produce sufficient to provide for the wants of the settlers, and may be a surplus for sale. It would be unwise to begin on too large a scale. Once started, the movement would grow, and many of them in all parts of the country would soon make an impression on the condition of the masses. In the interest of national safety, our statesmen ought to take the matter in hand speedily. If they have no consideration for the sufferings, physical and mental, of their fellow men, which they should have, they ought to consider that the existence of a large class of very poor and unemployed, is not only a source of weakness, but an element of danger to the nation. To allow the land to become a waste, and the people to become dependent for their food supply on foreign nations, not in the interest of the people, but for the benefit of landlords and capitalists, is a criminal neglect of the welfare of the people. The case is simple. We can produce enough food to feed more than four times our present population. Yet over 22,000,000 of our people depended on foreign wheat for their food in 1880, the last date I have at hand. The number depending on foreign wheat in 1821 was only 600,000. That number has been increasing every decade ever since. At the present time we are dependent on foreigners both for trade and food. A nation was never in a more helpless or dangerous condition. To allow a people to come to such a pass, is a crime crying for vengeance at the doors of our statesmen and leaders. The sooner we change our policy and begin to retrace our steps the better. The simplest and easiest way to get the people back to the land is to begin with home colonies on crown land. A few millions from the national purse for this purpose will be not only a safe but a very profitable

investment. At first it will be best to give to each as much land as he can cultivate himself, leaving each free to unite or not with others in their labour for mutual benefit. Compulsory co-operation, until men are trained to it, would only create jealousy of leadership, and wreck the undertaking. Any authority in such experiments must be that derived from themselves only, as any outside control would be certain to be looked upon as tyrannical oppression.

The greatest difficulty in the way of a speedy and a thorough change in the system of society is

Vested Interest

in present institutions. Most intelligent people will readily admit that our institutions work injuriously for the masses,—that wealth is badly distributed—that some get too rich without any effort or merit of their own—that the masses suffer the pangs of hunger often without any fault of their own—that there is enough wealth produced to feed, clothe, and house all well, and that national co-operation and a community of interest would be better than individualism and competition, if men were honest and good. Butthen, they are landlords, capitalists, successful farmers, manufacturers, shopkeepers, and well-placed professional and civil servants. Why should they sacrifice anything they have more than others for the common good? Those who have nothing are compelled to acknowledge that if they had houses, land, shares, pensions or privileges, they would stick to them as long as they could. What can we do with these people? They are very numerous and increasing in number. As a class they are intelligent and full of resources, notwithstanding the sneers of some socialists at their alleged want of brain. No doubt there are ignorant and imbecile men amongst them, but they are the exception—the majority are clever, and their cleverness has made most of them what they are. To convert all these to Socialism is hopeless, I think. I fear also that it would take many ages to convert a sufficient number of the workers to over-vote them, and compel them to relinquish their privileges and surplus wealth. What, then, can we do? We must proceed along the line of least resistance. If the goal of our efforts lies beyond the hill, and there is no way to reach it but over the top, we must go over the top. If we cannot go over the top, and there is no way but to pierce the hill, we must make a tunnel. But if we can go round the base of the hill with greater ease and comfort, there is no reason why we should make a tunnel or climb over the top. If we cannot convert the possessing classes, we can do something to conciliate them and disarm their opposition Therefore I propose, not as a matter of right but of expediency, that land and capital and existing privileges should remain the possession of present holders during the term of their life, but on their death, under regulations, shall become the property of the nation. I admit that the people collectively could take possession of land and capital without compensation, if the people were united and of one mind on the question. But they are not, and I see no prospect of making them united in any measurable time. When bandits kidnap a wealthy person and demand a ransom, it is easy to demonstrate that the bandits have no right to demand it; but if you cannot rescue the kidnapped without the ransom, you pay the ransom to get back the prisoner. As both land and capital have become private property, through the operation of laws and conditions existing prior to the birth of any now living, it seems to me expedient to allow all to remain in undisturbed possession till their death, on the condition that then it will become national property. To effect this, the first step will be to pass a

Suspensory Bill

in connection with the land, and if possible, capital as well. But it would not be wise to attempt too much at once. A boy saw some nuts in a bottle. He put his hand in and filled it with nuts and found he could not get his hand out. He was crying over his misfortune when someone told him to let go some of the nuts, which he did, and got his hand and some nuts out, and by repeating the operation got all the nuts out of the bottle. In a similar way, attempting too much at once may make it impossible to do anything at all—whilst doing what is possible to-day, will make the remainder possible to-morrow. When you want to see a friend at a distance, it would be very pleasant to be able to go there at one jump, but since that cannot be done, we walk the distance step by step till we reach the place. Some ardent spirits want to reach the distant millennium at a jump, but that is not possible, and we must stop where we are, or reach it step by step. The object of the Suspensory Bill will be to prevent the creation of any new vested interest either in land, minerals, or unearned increment. No more lands to be sold by the crown, county councils, municipalities, or any other public bodies. Unearned increment after the passing of the Suspensory Bill must go to the purse of parish councils, county councils, municipalities, or the state. Any minerals discovered must be the property of the nation, to be worked for the benefit of all. No more railways, canals, waterworks, tramways, gasworks, or other undertakings of a public nature, to be made for private profit—but all such in future to be undertaken by the county councils, corporations, or the state. No more land to be sold to private persons. All land on the death of present owners to revert to the state on such conditions as the legislature will

determine. All new sources of wealth of a public nature to be national property. The passing of a Suspensory Bill of such a nature would work wonders in the course of a few years, and would make the completion of nationalisation of land and capital practicable and comparatively easy. No new principle would be involved in the Bill, as it has been practised before, and is being used again at the present time in reference to the Church of England in Wales.

It is, I think, a question worthy of consideration whether it would or would not be wise to pass another Suspensory Bill in regard to

Buying and Selling

in general. All know that money lenders, rackrenters, sham traders, and others, through the operation of law and courts, are driving thousands upon thousands to ruin every year. Would it not be wise in the interest of national well-being to suspend all laws which make the state collector and executioner for usurers and robbers disguised under the name of traders? Such a suspension would destroy the credit system, which is a source of incalculable injury, and benefits no one really, except usurers and their class; and anything that would end the opportunities of such vampires would be a lasting benefit to the human race.

There are many

Alternative Schemes

to restore the land to the people. Henry George and his followers advocate the gradual taxing of the land till its full value is reached, and then it would not be of any benefit for any one to hold it as private property. Others are for buying it as it may be wanted, till the whole of it becomes national property. In passing, I may say that buying the land was the plan proposed by Robert Owen. In dealing with the land, there are several facts that ought to be kept constantly in mind. (1) The land of the British Islands belongs to the people of these Islands, in the same way and as absolutely as air and light belong to them. (2) No one had a right to take the land or to sell it, and no one had a right to buy it, any more than they have a right to sell and buy air and light. (3) Private property in land rests mainly on force and fraud. (4) According to laws made by landlords themselves, stolen property, though sold and innocently bought, may be recovered from the buyer without any compensation whatever. (5) It is clear in itself that the people have a right to take possession of the land without purchase or compensation whenever they decide to do so. But what is absolutely right in itself, is not always expedient to be done. (6) When private property in land began, that is, from the Conquest to 1660, the land bore all the

expenses of the state. The land also maintained the church and the poor. But in 1660 the land owners relieved themselves of their duties and gave the king power to tax the people to maintain the State. But finding it was not possible to wring from the people sufficient to meet the demand, the land owners agreed to pay 4/- in the £ of the gross annual value of their land. They paid it once. From 1692 to 1842, at 4/- in the £, they ought to have paid £1,482,000,000, but they only paid £320,000,000. From 1843 to 1876 they ought to have paid £988,256,000, but they only paid £35,381,000. At the present time the arrears of debt due from the land owners amounts to more than £2,000,000,000, which is a sum equal at least to the value of the land. It would be right on the part of the nation to insist on the payment of arrears, or in default, to take possession of the land. At all events, the possibility and the right to do that may be held, like the sword of Damocles, over the heads of landlords, to keep them within the bounds of reason, during the negotiations for the restoration of the land to the people. But the country is sufficiently great and wealthy to act generously towards the landlords But if they are to be treated with consideration, they on their part must not put needless obstacles in the way of land restoration; for if they do, the people may be exasperated and provoked to end the matter summarily, as the people of France did at the French Revolution. But where is the money to buy the land to come from? From the rent. The same way as with the houses: a land court may be established to fix the price of land required to be bought, and arrange the payment in instalments spread over so many years, and those payments to be made from the rent fund. Thus the land will become national property without borrowing money and paying exorbitant interest to financiers, and without confiscating a single penny of the market value of the land.

There are many ways a nation could become the owner of most of the sources of wealth. One method would be to grant monopolies to companies and others

For a fixed number of years only,

or for such a time as the investors get all their money back with a certain reasonable interest for the loan and use of their money. If the companies which supply London with water had been established on this plan, the water system of London would have been long ago the property of the people of London, and they would have had a more abundant supply at a cheaper rate, and with profit for the common purse in addition. The cost of supplying London with water is less than £700,000 a year; but London has to pay more than

£1,700,000 for the water supplied—the difference going to the pockets of shareholders. And these shareholders have never contributed a penny or a stroke of work towards bringing the water to London—the shareholders who found the money, and the toilers who made the works, being all dead long ago. Had the Railway monopolies been granted for fixed terms only, they would by this time be falling gradually into the hands of the community without purchase or compensation. We cannot alter the past, but we can and ought to see that the mistakes of the past are not committed again in the present. No new railway or canal, or any other public work ought to be sanctioned except for a fixed number of years—at the termination of which they shall become national property.

A better way still would be for the nation to do her work

Without Contractors and Money-lenders.

There is a great outcry against sweating, but sweating will never be abolished till the system of contracting is abolished, for contracting is the source of sweating. That the State could do without money-lenders, and contractors, and companies is certain. That such a thing has never been tried is owing probably to the fact that the State has been in the hands of landlords and capitalists, who have worked the political machine to put money in the pockets of themselves and their class. Money is lent to the Government on the security of the land, and the stability of the State. But the land would be valueless without the people and the labour of the workers. Labour applied to land is the source of all wealth. Therefore all money is lent on the strength of confidence that the people will continue to labour. Consequently all interest paid to money lenders is a tax on labour. But why should the State borrow from money-lenders? The more hands to handle the money and the more it will cost to the borrower. If the State must borrow, it should borrow direct, and save the commissions which make millionaires of usurers. But why should the State borrow money at all? It seems to me quite possible for the State to supply most of its wants, at all events, its home wants,

Without Money.

We have seen that the basis of credit is the land, labour, and stability. On these three, usurers lend their millions to the government—and not their own money only, but in most cases the money of others entrusted to them either for security or interest. And what do they get in return for the money lent? A piece of paper or parchment printed or written upon, with a stamp and a signature. For this stamped and signed paper the lenders part with their gold and silver,

and receive their interest annually, and for so long a time that they get all back without reducing the loan a single penny. But it is not gold and silver the State wants, but ships of war, guns, ammunition, food, clothing, and shelter for the soldiers and the like. And why should the State pay interest to money-lenders for money to obtain these things? If bankers part with their millions for pieces of paper, would not the people part with their commodities for the same or similar securities? It is clear to me that the government could dispense with the middlemen, and save the vast sums paid to them for doing what the State could do equally well for itself. As the State issues stamps with which we pay for sending letters, books, and parcels, so they could issue notes in convenient sums to pay the worker for his labour, the farmer for his wheat, the tailor for his clothing, the shipwright for his ships, and so on. On these there would be no interest to pay, or any other charges beyond the cost of production and distribution, and wear and tear of materials. With these notes the worker, farmer, tailor, and all others could buy their requirements as they do now with gold, silver, and copper. As a matter of fact the greatest part of the business of the world is transacted without ever using any gold or silver whatever. Canals, railways, and public works could be made by means of these notes without borrowing a single penny. The Manchester Ship Canal could have been made at millions less than it will cost when finished. If the towns of Manchester, Salford, Warrington, Widnes, Runcorn, and others interested in the making of the canal, had joined to make it, they could have taken power in their Act to issue notes for convenient sums on the security of all the towns concerned, which would be legal tenders in payment of wages, land, and all other materials required for the work. When the canal was finished the revenue from its trade, after paying current expenses, would go to redeem the notes, which in the course of years would all be cancelled and destroyed, and the canal would be the property of the towns, yielding annual profit for the benefit of all. In Jersey, I believe, many years ago, a public market was successfully built on this plan. It seems to me that some such plan ought to be adopted in the making of railways, and all such works, instead of allowing private individuals to make them for their own profit, which means, when analysed, a loss to the public.

But before much progress can be made, there is one huge injustice that must be removed, and that is

The National Debt.

There are some things that can be mended—but the National Debt must be ended, for it is too bad to be mended. From the very

beginning it has been, and continues to be a monstrous robbery of the people. Before 1660 there was no National Debt. The land of the country bore the expenses of the country. As the aristocracy had to find the means to carry on a war, from the land, wars were of short duration. But in 1660 the nominal owners of the land, who mainly made up the Parliament, and who had to bear the expenses of the country from the rent of the land, struck against rent, and passed a law to tax the people to keep the state, to save their own pockets. After that, since the aristocracy, who had all the power of the country in their hands, and who had neither to fight themselves nor to pay for the fighting, wars became frequent, long, and disastrous. Sufficient to carry on the wars could not be wrung from the people, and therefore money had to be borrowed, and then and future generations had to be taxed to pay interest on the loan. During the reign of William III., a nominal sum of £44,100,795 was borrowed, but the real sum lent was only £34,034,518; yet the state had to pay interest on the larger sum, and the larger sum would have to be paid in paying the debt. That is to say, the nation had to pay interest on over £10,000,000 which it had never received. If that is not wholesale robbery, robbery does not exist. At the close of 1815 the National Debt amounted to more than £800,000,000. Of that sum nearly £600,000,000 was in what were called the three per cent. The unjust steward in the Gospel reduced the debts about one half. But the unjust money-lenders of England knew a better way, to themselves, than that. They lent the government £60, and told the borrower to write down £100, which was done, and was called the three per cent. Out of every hundred of the debt of nearly six hundred millions, interest had to be paid on 40 pounds never received. In other words, out of the total debt, interest has been paid on over £300,000,000 never lent. Another way to look at it. The loan was not in gold, but in depreciated currency, or in goods at famine prices. It has been shown that the loan when reduced to the gold standard, in which the interest had to be paid, only amounted to £332,000,000. On that sum, up to 1881 £2,231,000,000 had been paid, and still owed £768,703,692, on which £30,000,000 yearly was paid in interest. Talk about robbers, pirates, bandits, highwaymen, burglars, forgers, embezzlers and all their class—you can lump them all together, and the result of all their robberies would be nothing compared to the legal standing robbery called the National Debt. It is difficult to write or talk about it in sober language; and it is almost inconceivable that any, except a nation of slaves or idiots, would continue to carry the burden without even a grunt, as the British do. The people of these Islands would be justified in

repudiating the debt, unless the government devise means for its speedy termination. No wonder money-lenders get rich. No wonder the masses are poor. They almost deserve to be poor for allowing themselves to be robbed in the barefaced manner they do. When the lower middle class come to feel the pangs of hunger and the agony of despair at the shame and ruin staring them in the face—and it will come, in fact, it is coming now, and that rapidly—wealth is getting into fewer hands—syndicates and gigantic companies are swamping the smaller traders and crushing all opposition by the mere power of money—when the ruin comes, it is to be hoped that its millions of victims will not remain so quiet and sheepish as the masses have done hitherto. An agitation ought to be started at once for the speedy termination or the repudiation of the National Debt, which presses like a nightmare on the vitals of the nation.

A new society will not come by a miracle, nor by one Act of Parliament. Thousands of agencies will have to be employed to bring the change about. It is time that all Socialists should begin to work as well as talk. Each one by himself and in co-operation with his fellows should see whether there is anything he and his fellows can do now to alter the condition of society without waiting for the national movement. The evils are manifest enough and the remedies as well. But talking about them will never cure them. A cynic might with great plausibility maintain that there is too much writing and talking. But whether that is true or not, it is certain that there is too little working and doing. If a tithe of the energy spent in talking and fighting were employed all over the country in possible schemes of self-help, even under present conditions a new society would be created in a comparatively short time. We neglect opportunities, and rob and tax ourselves in almost every possible way. We allow fashions, customs, opinions, habits, and temptations to tyrannise over us in almost everything. The

Drink Traffic

may be cited as an instance. It is beyond question that we can live a healthy and a vigorous life without alcoholic drinks. We can go further and say, we would live healthier, longer, better, and happier without alcohol than with it. Facts in abundance prove that to be true. Yet we voluntarily load ourselves with a burden four times as heavy as our National Debt. If we want a new society, let us begin by throwing off our shoulders the burden of the drink traffic. No law is required to do this. Cease to drink and become a sober nation. Whilst the curse of drink remains, little can be done to reconstruct society. We tax ourselves needlessly and voluntarily in many other things than drink. Heavy as the compulsory taxes are,

self-imposed taxes are heavier still. It does not need much to keep us in health and vigour. Simple and moderate fare, which is not costly, is the most conducive to health and longevity. As Socialists, "let us lay aside every weight, and the sin which doth so easily beset us, and let us run with patience the race that is set before us." What we can do for ourselves and for one another now, (and we could do a great deal if we were to try heartily and earnestly), we ought to do it, and do it at once. We have no right to ask others to do for us what we can do for ourselves. In the new society each one will be required to do all he can for the common weal. There will be no room for idlers in the new society. The new society to be established, will be a brotherhood of all, a fellowship of equals, a co-operation of all for the common good, and a community of interest in the wealth and enjoyments of the commonwealth. That is what Socialism means. Those who believe in Socialism cannot do better than begin to practise it at once, in order to prepare themselves for the coming change. If we cannot practise brotherhood now—if we cannot co-operate and assist one another now—if we cannot sacrifice self for the common good now—now when all these things are most needed, how can we expect a society, based on love, sacrifice, and brotherhood ever to come about. If Socialists everywhere were to begin to work, say, by co-operation, to provide themselves with free homes, or to supply themselves with provisions at wholesale prices, or in many other ways to better their conditions, much could be done in a very few years. The worst of it is that efforts of this sort almost always end in becoming engines to make profit. That should be avoided. There are too many profit-making machines already. Never forget that profit in trade, as in betting, is a loss to somebody. Remember always that the aim of Socialism is to establish a society where wealth will be produced for use and not for sale; and where, consequently, trading for profit will cease to be.

Socialism is an international question. It aims at forming a universal brotherhood of all nations. A great barrier in the way is the diversity of languages. It is therefore very desirable that all the nations should agree to adopt one of the living languages, to be taught in all schools throughout the world, so as to become the

Universal Language

of mankind. A generation would be sufficient to enable all the different nations to converse with one another in a language understood by all. Each nation could cultivate their own at the same time. As the English is already in use all over the world, the nations could do nothing better than adopt it, to be taught in addition to their own, to every child in all the schools of the world, and in a generation all races could talk to one another without an interpreter.

MSH 20-250

THE TIDE IS FLOWING STRONG.

Brave men prepare the social boat,
The tide is on the turn,
The crowds are watching on the shore,
And many beacons burn
The ebbing seemed to travel slow,
The hours lingered long,
But at the last the mighty tide
Is turning brisk and strong,

Be ready men to man the boat,
And launch it on the flood;
The star of hope lights up the sky,
And passions boil the blood.
The streams of life above their banks
Are rushing wild along,
And tidal waves of coming good,
Are rising high and strong.

The ship, "Good news of joy for all,"
Is sailing on her way;
And sailors brave, with might and main,
Are working night and day.
The winds from every point combine
To speed the ship along—
And mighty waves of human thoughts
Are rising high and strong.

The noble ship for long decades,
Has weathered calms and gales;
And storms of lightnings, rains, and winds,
Have often torn her sails
But safe are all her treasures, which
To all the world belong—
And after all, the good old ship
Is floating sound and strong.

Brave men prepare the social boat,
And man it well and full;
Through breakers and tempestuous waves
You will have yet to pull,
Before you meet the coming ship
To pilot her along,
Across the bar of foaming wrath,
And opposition strong.

Away, the telescope reveals
The vessel full in view;
She rides triumphant on the wave
Manned by a noble crew:
Bring her to harbour safely, whilst
The tide is flowing strong—
And to the world announce the news
With a triumphant song.

INTENTIONAL SECOND EXPOSURE

self-imposed taxes are heavier still. It does not need much to keep us in health and vigour. Simple and moderate fare, which is not costly, is the most conducive to health and longevity. As Socialists, "let us lay aside every weight, and the sin which doth so easily beset us, and let us run with patience the race that is set before us." What we can do for ourselves and for one another now, (and we could do a great deal if we were to try heartily and earnestly), we ought to do it, and do it at once. We have no right to ask others to do for us what we can do for ourselves. In the new society each one will be required to do all he can for the common weal. There will be no room for idlers in the new society. The new society to be established, will be a brotherhood of all, a fellowship of equals, a co-operation of all for the common good, and a community of interest in the wealth and enjoyments of the commonwealth. That is what Socialism means. Those who believe in Socialism cannot do better than begin to practise it at once, in order to prepare themselves for the coming change. If we cannot practise brotherhood now—if we cannot co-operate and assist one another now—if we cannot sacrifice self for the common good now—now when all these things are most needed, how can we expect a society, based on love, sacrifice, and brotherhood ever to come about. If Socialists everywhere were to begin to work, say, by co-operation, to provide themselves with free homes, or to supply themselves with provisions at wholesale prices, or in many other ways to better their conditions, much could be done in a very few years. The worst of it is that efforts of this sort almost always end in becoming engines to make profit. That should be avoided. There are too many profit-making machines already. Never forget that profit in trade, as in betting, is a loss to somebody. Remember always that the aim of Socialism is to establish a society where wealth will be produced for use and not for sale; and where, consequently, trading for profit will cease to be.

Socialism is an international question. It aims at forming a universal brotherhood of all nations. A great barrier in the way is the diversity of languages. It is therefore very desirable that all the nations should agree to adopt one of the living languages, to be taught in all schools throughout the world, so as to become the

Universal Language

of mankind. A generation would be sufficient to enable all the different nations to converse with one another in a language understood by all. Each nation could cultivate their own at the same time. As the English is already in use all over the world, the nations could do nothing better than adopt it, to be taught in addition to their own, to every child in all the schools of the world, and in a generation all races could talk to one another without an interpreter.

MSH 30 4-6

THE TIDE IS FLOWING STRONG.

Brave men prepare the social boat,
  The tide is on the turn,
The crowds are watching on the shore,
  And many beacons burn
The ebbing seemed to travel slow,
  The hours lingered long,
But at the last the mighty tide
  Is turning brisk and strong,

Be ready men to man the boat,
  And launch it on the flood;
The star of hope lights up the sky,
  And passions boil the blood.
The streams of life above their banks
  Are rushing wild along,
And tidal waves of coming good,
  Are rising high and strong.

The ship, "Good news of joy for all,"
  Is sailing on her way;
And sailors brave, with might and main,
  Are working night and day.
The winds from every point combine
  To speed the ship along—
And mighty waves of human thoughts
  Are rising high and strong.

The noble ship for long decades,
  Has weathered calms and gales;
And storms of lightnings, rains, and winds,
  Have often torn her sails
But safe are all her treasures, which
  To all the world belong—
And after all, the good old ship
  Is floating sound and strong.

Brave men prepare the social boat,
  And man it well and full;
Through breakers and tempestuous waves
  You will have yet to pull,
Before you meet the coming ship
  To pilot her along,
Across the bar of foaming wrath,
  And opposition strong.

Away, the telescope reveals
  The vessel full in view;
She rides triumphant on the wave
  Manned by a noble crew:
Bring her to harbour safely, whilst
  The tide is flowing strong—
And to the world announce the news
  With a triumphant song.

HYMNS & SONGS FOR THE CHURCH OF MAN.

PRICE 1s.

"This is a very remarkable little volume. The writer, who conceals himself under the *nom de plume* "Munullog," is a man of extraordinary natural intelligence, elevation of spirit, and nobility of character. . . . His logical power is almost as strong a feature of his work as the sound, healthy sentiment that pervades it. It is impossible to read through the prose essay on "Creeds," which opens the volume, and the other prose essay on "Religious Reform," with which it closes, without experiencing a very lively feeling of delight at being brought into contact with the brave and wise man who penned them. Did the *Brochure* contain nothing but these two papers, it would be a great bargain at the shilling that is charged for it; but we feel that there is something singularly incongruous in attempting to assign any monetary value whatever to these compositions, which are obviously the frank and unconsciously courageous utterances of a soul that stands "four-square to every wind that blows."

The Radical, May 14th, 1881.

SOCIAL SONGS.

PRICE, in Paper Covers, 1s.; Cloth Boards, 2s.

"Full of tuneful versification, with a lesson in every line."

Labour World.

"Over 60 poetical pieces, of which none are poor, and some are excellent. . . . I know of nothing so severe on religious hypocrisy that has appeared since the days of Hudibras. . . . DR. E. PAN JONES, in the *Celt.*

"Full of pregnant thoughts."—*The Journal.*

"The writer, whoever he is, has large sympathies, and considerable powers as a versifier. Some of the pieces are rather rough, but there are others that touch a high point of excellence."—*The Workman's Times*

SOCIALISM AND THE POPE'S ENCYCLICAL.

PRICE THREEPENCE.

AN UNAUTHORISED PROGRAMME.

PRICE TWOPENCE.

ON THE IMPORTANCE OF RIGHT METHODS IN TEACHING SOCIALISM.

PRICE ONE PENNY.

COMMON MISCONCEPTIONS ABOUT SOCIALISM.

PRICE ONE PENNY.

END OF
TITLE